

REMARKS

This Request for Reconsideration is responsive to the official action dated October 18, 2007. Claims 1-20 and 22-34 were pending in the application. In the official action, claims 1-20 and 22-34 were rejected. Claims 1-20 and 22-34 thus remain for consideration.

Applicants submit that claims 1-20 and 22-34 are in condition for allowance and request withdrawal of the rejections in light of the following remarks.

\$102 and \$103 Rejections

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Srinivasan et al. (US 2001/0023436).

Claims 1, 4, 6-27, and 31-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vienneau et al. (US 2002/0157105) in view of Ramaswamy (US 2004/0003394).

Claims 3, 5, and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vienneau, in view of Ramaswamy, and further in view of Srinivasan.

Claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vienneau, in view of Ramaswamy, and further in view of Puente et al. (US 2003/0033606).

Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims (claims 1, 22, and 26) are patentable over Srinivasan, Vienneau, Ramaswamy, and Puente.

Applicants' invention as recited in the independent claims is directed toward a method of processing a video signal, a method of treating a processed video signal, and a video processing system that generates a processed video signal. Each of the claims recites that the processed video signal is embedded with graphics metadata. Each of the claims further recites that the embedded graphics metadata includes "at least alphanumeric content data which is distinct from any style and

format data." Supporting disclosure for such metadata, and a description of the advantages of embedding such metadata in a video signal, are provided in the specification at, for example, paragraphs [0019], [0031], and [0058]. A description of the problems overcome by embedding such metadata in a video signal is provided in the specification at, for example, paragraph [0012].

Notably, the recited "graphics metadata" is data that can be used to derive pixel values for a display screen. (See e.g., specification paragraph [0033].) Thus, the graphics metadata does not directly define pixel values, yet is not unrelated to pixel values.

Neither Srinivasan, Vienneau, Ramaswamy, nor Puente discloses the embedding in a video signal of "graphics metadata" including "at least alphanumeric content data which is distinct from any style and format data." In particular, Applicants would like to comment on the Srinivasan, Vienneau, and Ramaswamy references.

The Examiner asserts that Srinivasan's paragraphs [0085] and [0089] disclose embedding into a video signal graphics metadata that includes alphanumeric content data which is distinct from any style and format data. (Official Action section 4.) However, close inspection of Srinivasan's paragraphs [0085] and [0089] reveals that Srinivasan merely discloses adding to a video signal "annotations including interactive icons, animated graphics, text, audio etc." (Srinivasan paragraph [0085], lines 4-6.) Thus, Srinivasan does not specify the addition of "text" in the sense of metadata used to derive pixel values, but rather, discloses the addition of "text" in the sense of data that is to be displayed on a screen (e.g. pixel values). Accordingly, the "text" referred to in Srinivasan must necessarily be associated with a style and a format. Therefore, Srinivasan fails to disclose the embedding in a video

signal of "graphics metadata" including "at least alphanumeric content data which is distinct from any style and format data."

Regarding Vienneau, the Examiner asserts that the reference discloses "adding graphics metadata into [a] video signal." (Official Action section 6.) However, close inspection of Vienneau reveals that Vienneau's "first metadata 721," "second metadata 722," and "third metadata 723" are supplied in the form of "metafiles 921, 922, 923." (See e.g. Vienneau paragraphs [0065] and [0070].) Thus, Vienneau fails to disclose embedding graphics metadata into a video signal, let alone embedding graphics metadata that includes at least alphanumeric content data which is distinct from any style and format data.

Further, Ramaswamy does not cure the deficiencies of Vienneau because Ramaswamy does not disclose the embedding of graphics metadata into a video signal. That is, Ramaswamy does not disclose the embedding into a video signal of metadata used to derive pixel values, but rather, discloses the embedding into a video signal of metadata unrelated to pixel values. More specifically, Ramaswamy discloses the embedding of a time stamp (Ramaswamy paragraph [0022]), digital rights management information (Ramaswamy paragraph [0028]), a program name, a program source, time codes, or date/time of capture information (Ramaswamy paragraph [0029]). None of those can be construed as "graphics metadata" because they are not used to derive pixel values.

Since neither Srinivasan, Vienneau, Ramaswamy, nor Puente discloses the embedding in a video signal of "graphics metadata" including "at least alphanumeric content data which is distinct from any style and format data," Applicants believe that claims 1, 22, and 26 are patentable over Srinivasan, Vienneau, Ramaswamy, and Puente - taken either alone or in combination - on at least this basis.

Further, Applicants submit that the dependent claims 2-20, 23-25, and 37-34 are patentable over Srinivasan, Vienneau, Ramaswamy, and Puente for at least the same reasons as discussed in connection with claims 1, 22, and 26.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to telephone the undersigned at (908) 654-5000.

The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 12-1095.

The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Dated: February 8, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Bruno Polito

Registration No.: 38,580
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant